Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/718,996	WEI, NING	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	JACQUELINE DIRAMIO	1641	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP		=	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extractional extractional extractional extraction of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present of the pre			ne issues for
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ⁻¹		cleu ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>37</u> .	· —	be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>2,5,6,12 and 37-47</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a
10.		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	,	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Bao-Thuy L. Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1641	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendment to claim 41 raises new issues that would require further consideration, particularly under 103(a), and a new search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons presented in the final rejection. Applicant argues (see pages 7-9) that it would not have been obvious to combine the Brooks et al. reference with Buck et al. given that excess analyte was not even a problem in Brooks et al. However, this argument is not found persuasive or relevant, given the teaching of and motivation for including an analyte modulating zone (i.e. scavenging zone) within a test strip device and method of use as taught by Buck, wherein it would have been obvious to include this zone with the method and device of Brooks et al. in order to achieve the benefits taught by Buck, wherein Buck teaches the benefit of including an analyte modulating zone (AMZ) within a test strip in order to remove a fraction of an analyte from a test sample prior to the sample reaching an analyte test zone to thereby increase the detectable range of analyte concentration, which is beneficial for samples that contain a high concentration of analyte.

In addition, Applicant presents arguments over the amendments to claim 41 (see page 8), which, as discussed above, will not be entered given that they raise new issues that would require further consideration and a new search.